

Virtual R&D Teams: A Sustainable Infrastructure for Promoting SMEs

Nader Ale Ebrahim, Shamsuddin Ahmed and Zahari Taha

Abstract—Small and medium sized enterprises (SMEs) are a major part of the industrial economies. Their survival and growth has therefore been a prominent issue. Research and development (R&D) enables firms to create new technologies and/or to build on existing technologies obtained through technology transfer. Nowadays unpredictable environment suggests that many firms seek new ways of conducting their business through some kind of R&D activities to make a profit and stay ahead of the competition. To survive in the global economy SMEs have to improve their products and processes exploiting their intellectual capital in a dynamic network of knowledge-intensive relations inside and outside their borders. SMEs need to focus on core competences for efficiency matters; they need to cooperate with external partners to compensate for other competences and resources. Responding to the increasing de-centralization and globalization of work processes, many SMEs have responded to their dynamic environments by introducing virtual teams. Virtual teams are growing in popularity. By a comprehensive literature review this article following define a virtual teams, SMEs and its characteristics, addressing a sustainable infrastructure for promoting SMEs. Finally conclude that managers of SMEs should invest less in tangible assets, but more in the areas of expanding virtual R&D activities which will directly generate their future competitive advantage. Future research need to elaborate the effect of virtual R&D team working on the performance of SMEs.

Keywords: Virtual Team, Small and medium sized enterprises (SMEs), R&D, Literature Review

I. INTRODUCTION

Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs) play an important role to promote economic development. The internationalization of R&D network is recent phenomenon [1]. Responding to the increasing de-centralization and globalization of work processes, many organizations have responded to their dynamic environments by introducing virtual teams. Virtual teams are growing in popularity [2]. Additionally, the rapid development of new communication technologies such as the Internet has accelerated this trend so that today, most of the larger organization employs virtual teams to some degree [3]. Internet will become in the future an important source of competitive advantage [4]. Information technology is providing the infrastructure necessary to support the development of new organization forms. Virtual teams represent one such organizational form, one that could revolutionize the workplace and provide organizations with unprecedented level of flexibility and responsiveness. The employed Web Services technology, although very popular nowadays but it is still not mature enough, so dealing with it can bring new findings [5]. Considering that R&D teams need to access and retrieve information from as many sources as possible [1], virtual teams are important mechanisms for organizations seeking to leverage scarce resources across geographic and other boundaries [6].

Faced with the challenges of increased globalization of markets and of technological change, SMEs need reinforced support through transnational research cooperation to enhance their innovation and research investment. SMEs' survival depended on their capability to improve their performance and produce goods that could meet international standards [7]. In other words, a certain level of competitiveness may be a prerequisite for an SME's survival when dealing with dynamic conditions in the business environment. To compete with global competition and, overcome rapid technology change and product variety proliferation in the new manufacturing environment, SMEs must be able to sustain product innovation [8]. Internationalization holds much potential for the growth of SMEs [9]. One very important trend to enable new knowledge creation and transfer in and to SME's is the development of collaborative environments and networks to increase their innovation capabilities as a single unit but also the capabilities of the network as a whole through collective learning [10].

N., Ale Ebrahim is Technology Management PhD candidate in the Department of Engineering Design and Manufacture, Faculty of Engineering, University of Malaya, 50603, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia. (Phone: +60-17-3942458; fax: +60-3-79675330; e-mail: aleebrahim@perdana.um.edu.my).

S., Ahmed is currently an Associate Professor in Manufacturing at the University of Malaya (UM), 50603, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, (e-mail: ahmed@um.edu.my).

Z., Taha is currently director and Professor of Centre for Product Design and Manufacturing (CPDM) Faculty of Engineering University of Malaya (UM), 50603, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia. (e-mail: zahari_taha@um.edu.my).

In this paper first based on earlier work define virtual teams, SMEs and its characteristics, addressing a sustainable infrastructure for promoting SMEs. Finally highlight that managers of SMEs should invest less in tangible assets, but more in the areas of expanding virtual R&D activities which will directly generate their future competitive advantage. This paper would help researchers, managers and policy makers to better foster virtual R&D teams in SMEs. Camarinha-Matos and Afsarmanesh [11] conclude that, setting-up an infrastructure for virtual team still requires a large engineering effort, which represents a major obstacle for the implantation of this new paradigm.

II. DEFINITION OF VIRTUAL TEAM

Virtual teams are comprised of members who are located in more than one physical location. This team trait has fostered extensive use of a variety of forms of computer-mediated communication that enable geographically dispersed members to coordinate their individual efforts and inputs [12]. Gassmann and Von Zedtwitz [13] defined “virtual team as a group of people and sub-teams who interact through interdependent tasks guided by common purpose and work across links strengthened by information, communication, and transport technologies.” Another definition suggests that virtual teams, are distributed work teams whose members are geographically dispersed and coordinate their work predominantly with electronic information and communication technologies (e-mail, video-conferencing, telephone, etc.) [3], different authors have identified diverse. From the perspective of [14] virtual teams are groups of individuals collaborating in the execution of a specific project while geographically and often temporally distributed, possibly anywhere within (and beyond) their parent organization. Lurey and Raisinghani [15] defined virtual teams - groups of people who work together although they are often dispersed across space, time, and/or organizational boundaries. Amongst the different definitions of the concept of a virtual team the following from is one of the most widely accepted: [16], “we define virtual teams as groups of geographically, organizationally and/or time dispersed workers brought together by information technologies to accomplish one or more organization tasks”. The degree of geographic dispersion within a virtual team can vary widely from having one member located in a different location than the rest of the team to having each member located in a different country [17].

III. VIRTUAL TEAMS CHARACTERISTICS

Virtual R&D teams which members do not work at the same time or place [18] often face tight schedules and a need to start quickly and perform instantly [6]. Virtual team may allow people to collaborate more productivity at a distance, but the trip to coffee corner or across the hallway to a trusted colleague is still the most reliable and effective way to review and revise a new idea [19]. Virtual teams reduce time-to-market [20]. Lead Time or Time to market has been generally admitted to be one of the most important keys for success in manufacturing companies [21]. Table 1 summarizes some of the main advantages and Table 2 some of the main disadvantages associated with virtual teaming.

Table 1: some of the main advantages associated with virtual teaming.

Advantages	Reference
Reduce relocation time and costs, reduced travel costs	[2, 22-26]
Virtual teams reduce time-to-market [Time also has an almost 1:1 correlation with cost, so cost will likewise be reduced if the time-to market is quicker [27]]	[20, 21, 26, 28-32]
Ability to tap selectively into center of excellence, using the best talent regardless of location	[2, 25, 33, 34]
Greater productivity, shorter development times	[22, 32]
Producing better outcomes and attract better employees	[23, 35]
Provide organizations with unprecedented level of flexibility and responsiveness	[16, 28, 36]
Respond quickly to changing business environments	[24, 32]
Sharing knowledge, experiences	[37, 38]
Enable organizations to respond faster to increased competition	[36, 39]
Better team outcomes (quality, productivity, and satisfaction)	[40, 41]
Higher team effectiveness and efficiency	[20, 42]

Table 2: some of the main disadvantages associated with virtual teaming.

Disadvantages	references
lack of physical interaction	[23] [2, 26, 43]
Decrease monitoring and control of activities	[44]
Challenges of determining the appropriate task technology fit	[45, 46]
Challenges of managing conflict	[46, 47]
Cultural and functional diversity in virtual teams lead to differences in the members’ thought processes. Develop trust among the members are challenging	[26, 48, 49]

IV. R&D AND DISTRIBUTED TEAM

Research and development are subject to different location drivers[50]. Many firms started to acquire their knowledge from external sources [51]. R&D units in foreign countries have gained more responsibilities and competencies besides the still-existing traditional mode of adapting products developed in the home country and technical support for production abroad [52]. Trends over the last decade have seen China and India emerge as attractive R&D destinations for U.S. [53]. In a recent study, Li and Yue [54] building on von Zedtwitz and Gassmann's [50] seminal work, suggested that international research and development processes have two key dimensions: functional focus (either research oriented or development oriented) of R&D activities and geographic dispersion or concentration of R&D sites. These two dimensions lead to four categories of R&D configuration in a host country[54].:

1. Concentrated research and development;
2. Dispersed research and concentrated development;
3. Concentrated research and dispersed development;
4. Dispersed research and development.

Changes in telecommunications and data processing capabilities make it possible to coordinate research, marketing and production operation around the world [55]. Technological change is a highly dynamic process that may quickly relocate to take advantage of optimum conditions for growth [53]. For most R&D teams, being virtual are a matter of degree [14]

V. SMALL AND MEDIUM ENTERPRISES (SME)

Small and medium sized enterprises (SMEs) are a major part of the industrial economies [56, 57]. Their survival and growth has therefore been a prominent issue. Beck et al.[58] explores the relationship between the relative size of the Small and Medium Enterprise (SME) sector, economic growth, and poverty alleviation using a sample of 45 countries, and found that a strong, positive association between the importance of SMEs and GDP per capita growth. SMEs can successfully enter the global market if they can fulfill the customer needs regarding features and quality of products [30].

Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs) play an important role to promote economic development. SMEs in the beginning of R&D activities always face capital shortage and need technological assistance. In most countries, SMEs dominate the industrial and commercial infrastructure [59]. More importantly SMEs play an important role in foreign direct investment (FDI) [60]. Many economists believe that the wealth of nations and the growth of their economies strongly depend upon their SMEs' performance [61]. In many developed and developing countries, small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) are the unsung heroes that bring stability to the national economy. They help buffer the shocks that come with the boom and bust of economic cycles. SMEs also serve as the key engine behind equalizing income disparity among workers [62]. China's recent rapid growth is also linked to the emergence of many new small firms in village townships and in coastal areas, often in new industries [63].

VI. VIRTUAL R&D TEAMS AND SMES

SMEs seem to be appropriate units to behave like network nodes because of their lean structure, adaptability to market evolution, active involvement of versatile human resources, ability to establish sub-contracting relations and good technological level of their products [64]. In light of the above, SMEs have advantages in terms of flexibility, reaction time, and innovation capacity that make them central actors in the new economy [65]. The traditional independence of small firms is being replaced by a network environment [66]. Generally speaking three types of technologies are picked up by SMEs: small scale technologies, labor intensive technologies, and specialized high technology know-how [55] creating networks in the cycle of the management of these technologies is of a high importance.

To survive in the global economy SMEs have to improve their products and processes exploiting their intellectual capital in a dynamic network of knowledge-intensive relations inside and outside their borders[67]. Hanna and Walsh [66] found that if small firms want to make a step change in their technological and innovation base they may have to rethink their approach to cooperation. SMEs need to focus on core competences for efficiency matters; they need to cooperate with external partners to compensate for other competences and resources. [68]. Despite the widespread publicity of information technology, the application of Internet technology to upgrade and enhance the product design and business operation by most enterprises, especially for the small and medium sized enterprises, is still at its infancy [69]. SMEs need appropriate and up-to-date knowledge in order to compete and there is a strong need to create, share and disseminate knowledge within SME's [70]. Especially in the emerging and dynamic markets the shared knowledge creation and innovation may speed up market development [71]. Gassmann and Keupp [72]found that managers of SMEs should invest less in tangible assets, but more in those areas that will directly generate their future competitive advantage (e.g., in R&D to generate knowledge, and in their employees' creativity to stimulate incremental innovations in already existing technologies).

VII. CHARACTERISTICS OF SMES

In order to have a better understanding of SMEs behavior, a brief knowledge of the characteristics of SMEs is a must therefore the major characteristics of SMEs are listed in the Table 3 and Table 4 .SME has different characteristics that

distinguish them from large corporations and that can of course change across different countries and cultures; they are generally independent, multi-tasking, cash-limited and based on personal relationships and informality , as well as actively managed by the owners, highly personalized, largely local in their area of operation and largely dependent on internal sources to finance growth [73].

Table 3: some of the major advantages of SMEs

Advantages	Reference
Generally dominated by the entrepreneur (owner-manager)	[74-76]
Ability to respond quickly to customer requests and market changes	[74, 75, 77-80]
Being flexible and responding rapidly to change, dynamic behavior	[59, 64, 75, 77, 81-83].
Driven by client demands , Quick decision	[59, 75, 84, 85]
Un bureaucratic, processes and flat and flexible structures	[59, 75, 77, 85-88]
SMEs in most cases operate in a dense network of inter-firm relationships and consequently manage a great amount of information	[89, 90]
Are good at multi-tasking due to SME's entrepreneurs are generally "all-rounders" with basic knowledge in many areas	[75, 88]
Focus more on medium-term survival than long-term profits	
Creating new jobs and reducing unemployment	[85, 91, 92]
SMEs are knowledge creators	[76, 93]
Have significant intangible assets	[94]

Table 4: some of the major disadvantages of SMEs

Disadvantages	Reference
Scarce resources and manpower	[9, 66, 68, 82, 88, 94, 95]
limited degree of information technology (IT) implementation	[57, 67, 76, 87, 95, 96]
Difficulty in finding the financial support for technical work, human resource, plant and equipment, marketing	[8, 59]
Difficulty converting research and development into effective innovation, that is to say, innovation that leads to positive return/high growth	[97, 98]
Lack some of the essential resources for innovation, Severe resource limitations in R&D	[87, 99-101]
May not have formal R&D activities	[102]
SMEs formulate strategies on the basis of what is available to them	[7]
Rely on outdated technology, labor intensive and traditional management practices	[58, 59]
Lagging in the exporting	[103]

VIII. CONCLUSION AND DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

One of the main producers of wealth and prosperity of industrialized countries is the existence of sustainable systems, capable of converting technological innovation assets into substantial levels of industrial productivity, wealth and global competitiveness[104]. A global market requires a short product development cycle; hence SMEs are also forced into altering from sequential to concurrent product development. SMEs are the key players in the innovation system and the economy of a country, despite their size limits they bring about a lot of creativity into the products and services they offer through research and development. Virtual teams are dramatically influencing organizations and doing virtual R&D for SMEs is not a choice but an obligation to reduce the time-to-market in the intensively competitive market environment. Along with the findings of Gassmann and Keupp [72], managers of SMEs should invest less in tangible assets, but more in those areas that will directly generate their future competitive advantage such as R&D. Simple transmission of information between new product teams' members is not adequate; the virtual R&D team should also constructively interact in effective communication. Therefore as the first step managers of SMEs should move towards the concept that virtual teams are vital factors in modern organizations and as the next step an action plan for bringing the concept to practice shall be devised and executed.

As another important point the evidence shows management of virtual R&D team in SMEs is largely in its infancy. While most of the research activities relevant to SMEs do not encourage and support international research cooperation and technology transfer, such networking will be potentially advantageous. Such potential advantages have been listed in Table 3. Hence it is vital to bridge this gap and unlock growth opportunities for SMEs through research, and help them carry out or outsource research in order to develop new technology based products, processes and services, exploit research results, acquire technological know-how and train their employees to incorporate new development processes.

The extensive review shows that while a considerable number of studies and research efforts have been conducted and concentrated on SMEs or virtual R&D teams, limited work have been directed towards exploring and analyzing the existing inter-relation. Therefore future research shall be aimed at shifting away from investigating SMEs and virtual R&D teams separately to the formation and development of a collaborative system which can support a dispersed team effectively. Keeping virtual R&D teams in processes, operating innovatively, effectively and efficiently is of a high importance, but the

issue has poorly been addressed simultaneously in the previous studies, specially from the perspectives of SME collaboration. In many cases the knowledge required in the development of new products, services or processes does not fully reside inside the organizational boundaries. Consequently in high-risk areas, R&D collaboration can be used as an optional strategy for risk sharing and mitigation, among SMEs which are suffering from lack of resources.

REFERENCES:

1. Kafourous, M.I., et al., *The role of internationalization in explaining innovation performance*. Technovation, 2008. **28**: p. 63–74.
2. Cascio, W.F., *Managing a virtual workplace*. The Academy of Management Executive, 2000. **14**(3): p. 81-90.
3. Hertel, G.T., S. Geister, and U. Konradt, *Managing virtual teams: A review of current empirical research*. Human Resource Management Review, 2005. **15**: p. 69–95.
4. Piscitello, L. and F. Sgobbi, *Globalisation, E-Business and SMEs: Evidence from the Italian District of Prato* Journal Small Business Economics 2004. **22**(5): p. 333-347.
5. Witczynski, M., *Network-Centric Collaboration and Supporting Fireworks*, in *IFIP International Federation for Information Processing*, L. Camarinha-Matos, H. Afsarmanesh, and M. Ollus, Editors. 2006, Springer: Boston. p. 407-416.
6. Munkvold, B.E. and I. Zigurs, *Process and technology challenges in swift-starting virtual teams*. Information & Management, 2007. **44**: p. 287–299.
7. Gomez, J.O. and M. Simpson, *Achieving competitive advantage in the Mexican footwear industry*. Benchmarking: An International Journal, 2007. **14**(3): p. 289-305.
8. Laforet, S., *Size, strategic, and market orientation affects on innovation*. Journal of Business Research (Article in press), 2007.
9. Lu, J.W. and P.W. Beamish, *SME internationalization and performance: Growth vs. profitability*. Journal of International Entrepreneurship, 2006. **4**: p. 27–48.
10. Flores, M., *IFIP International Federation for Information Processing*, in *Network-Centric Collaboration and Supporting Fireworks*. 2006, Springer: Boston. p. 55-66.
11. Camarinha-Matos, L.M. and H. Afsarmanesh, *Elements of a base VE infrastructure* Computers in Industry, 2003. **51**(2): p. 139-163.
12. Peters, L.M. and C.C. Manz, *Identifying antecedents of virtual team collaboration*. Team Performance Management, 2007. **13**(3/4): p. 117-129.
13. Gassmann, O. and M. Von Zedtwitz, *Trends and determinants of managing virtual R&D teams*. R&D Management 2003. **33**(3): p. 243-262.
14. Leenders, R.T.A.J., J.M.L.V. Engelen, and J. Kratzer, *Virtuality, communication, and new product team creativity: a social network perspective*. Journal of Engineering and Technology Management, 2003. **20**: p. 69–92.
15. Lurey, J.S. and M.S. Raisinghani, *An empirical study of best practices in virtual teams* Information & Management, 2001. **38**(8): p. 523-544.
16. Powell, A., G. Piccoli, and B. Ives, *Virtual teams: a review of current literature and directions for future research*. The Data base for Advances in Information Systems, 2004. **35**(1): p. 6–36.
17. Staples, D.S. and L. Zhao, *The Effects of Cultural Diversity in Virtual Teams Versus Face-to-Face Teams*. Group Decision and Negotiation, 2006 **15**(4): p. 389-406.
18. Stoker, J.I., et al., *Leadership and innovation: relations between leadership, individual characteristics and the functioning of R&D teams*. The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 2001. **12**(7): p. 1141 – 1151.
19. Gassmann, O. and M. Von Zedtwitz, *Innovation Processes in Transnational Corporations*. International Handbook of Innovation, ed. L.V. Shavinina. 2003: Elsevier Science Ltd.
20. May, A. and C. Carter, *A case study of virtual team working in the European automotive industry*. International Journal of Industrial Ergonomics, 2001. **27**: p. 171-186.
21. Sorli, M., et al., *Managing product/process knowledge in the concurrent/simultaneous enterprise environment*. Robotics and Computer-Integrated Manufacturing, 2006. **22**: p. 399–408.
22. McDonough, E.F., K.B. Kahn, and G. Barczak, *An investigation of the use of global, virtual, and collocated new product development teams*. The Journal of Product Innovation Management, 2001. **18**(2): p. 110–120.
23. Rice, D.J., et al., *Improving the Effectiveness of Virtual Teams by Adapting Team Processes*. Computer Supported Cooperative Work, 2007. **16**: p. 567–594.
24. Bergiel, J.B., E.B. Bergiel, and P.W. Balsmeier, *Nature of virtual teams: a summary of their advantages and disadvantages*. Management Research News, 2008. **31**(2): p. 99-110.
25. Fuller, M.A., A.M. HARDIN, and R.M. DAVISON, *Efficacy in Technology-Mediated Distributed Team* Journal of Management Information Systems, 2006. **23**(3): p. 209-235.
26. Kankanhalli, A., B.C.Y. Tan, and K.-K. Wei, *Conflict and Performance in Global Virtual Teams*. Journal of Management Information Systems, 2006. **23**(3): p. 237-274.
27. Rabelo, L. and T.H.S. Jr., *Sustaining growth in the modern enterprise: A case study*. Journal of Engineering and Technology Management JET-M, 2005. **22**: p. 274-290.
28. Chen, T.-Y., *Knowledge sharing in virtual enterprises via an ontology-based access control approach*. Computers in Industry, 2008. **Article In press**: p. No of Pages 18.
29. Shachaf, P., *Cultural diversity and information and communication technology impacts on global virtual teams: An exploratory study*. Information & Management, 2008 **45**(2): p. 131-142.
30. Kusar, J., et al., *How to reduce new product development time*. Robotics and Computer-Integrated Manufacturing 2004. **20**: p. 1-15.
31. Ge, Z. and Q. Hu, *Collaboration in R&D activities: Firm-specific decisions*. European Journal of Operational Research 2008. **185**: p. 864-883.
32. Mulebeke, J.A.W. and L. Zheng, *Incorporating integrated product development with technology road mapping for dynamism and innovation*. International Journal of Product Development 2006 **3**(1): p. 56 - 76.
33. Criscuolo, P., *On the road again: Researcher mobility inside the R&D network*. Research Policy, 2005. **34**: p. 1350–1365.
34. Samarah, I., S. Paul, and S. Tadisina, *Collaboration Technology Support for Knowledge Conversion in Virtual Teams: A Theoretical Perspective*. in *40th Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences (HICSS)*. 2007. Hawai.
35. Martins, L.L., L.L. Gilson, and M.T. Maynard, *Virtual teams: What do we know and where do we go from here?* Journal of Management, 2004. **30**(6): p. 805–835.
36. Hunsaker, P.L. and J.S. Hunsaker, *Virtual teams: a leader's guide*. Team Performance Management, 2008. **14**(1/2): p. 86-101.
37. Rosen, B., S. Furst, and R. Blackburn, *Overcoming Barriers to Knowledge Sharing in Virtual Teams*. Organizational Dynamics, 2007. **36**(3): p. 259–273.
38. Zakaria, N., A. Amelinckx, and D. Wilemon, *Working Together Apart? Building a Knowledge-Sharing Culture for Global Virtual Teams*. Creativity and Innovation Management, 2004. **13**(1): p. 15-29.
39. Pauleen, D.J., *An Inductively Derived Model of Leader-Initiated Relationship Building with Virtual Team Members*. Journal of Management Information Systems, 2003. **20**(3): p. 227-256.
40. Gaudes, A., et al., *A Framework for Constructing Effective Virtual Teams* The Journal of E-working 2007 **1**(2): p. 83-97

41. Ortiz de Guinea, A., J. Webster, and S. Staples. *A Meta-Analysis of the Virtual Teams Literature*. in *Symposium on High Performance Professional Teams Industrial Relations Centre*. 2005. School of Policy Studies, Queen's University, Kingston, Canada.
42. Shachaf, P. and N. Hara, *Team Effectiveness in Virtual Environments: An Ecological Approach*, in *Teaching and Learning with Virtual Teams*, P.a.G. Ferris, S., Editor. 2005, Idea Group Publishing. p. 83-108.
43. Hossain, L. and R.T. Wigand, *ICT Enabled Virtual Collaboration through Trust*. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 2004. **10**(1).
44. Pawar, K.S. and S. Sharifi, *Physical or virtual team collocation: Does it matter?* *International Journal of Production Economics* 1997. **52**: p. 283-290.
45. Qureshi, S. and D. Vogel, *Adaptiveness in Virtual Teams: Organisational Challenges and Research Directions*. *Group Decision and Negotiation* 2001. **10**(1): p. 27-46
46. Ocker, R.J. and J. Fjermestad, *Communication differences in virtual design teams: findings from a multi-method analysis of high and low performing experimental teams*. *The DATA BASE for Advances in Information Systems*, 2008. **39**(1): p. 51-67.
47. Hinds, P.J. and M. Mortensen, *Understanding Conflict in Geographically Distributed Teams: The Moderating Effects of Shared Identity, Shared Context, and Spontaneous Communication*. *Organization Science*, 2005. **16**(3): p. 290-307.
48. Paul, S., et al. *Understanding Conflict in Virtual Teams: An Experimental Investigation using Content Analysis*. in *38th Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences*. 2005 Hawaii.
49. Poehler, L. and T. Schumacher, *The Virtual Team Challenge: Is It Time for Training?*, in *PICMET 2007* 2007 Portland, Oregon - USA p. 2205-2211.
50. von Zedtwitz, M. and O. Gassmann, *Market versus technology drive in R&D internationalization: four different patterns of managing research and development*. *Research Policy*, 2002. **31**(4): p. 569-588.
51. Erkena, H. and V. Gilsing, *Relocation of R&D—a Dutch perspective*. *Technovation*, 2005 **25**: p. 1079–1092.
52. Reger, G., *Coordinating globally dispersed research centers of excellence—the case of Philips Electronics*. *Journal of International Management*, 2004. **10**: p. 51– 76.
53. Hegde, D. and D. Hicks, *The maturation of global corporate R&D: Evidence from the activity of U.S. foreign subsidiaries*. *Research Policy*, 2008. **37**: p. 90–406.
54. Li, J. and D.R. Yue, *Managing Global Research and Development in China: Patterns of R&D Configuration and Evolution*. *Technology Analysis & Strategic Management*, 2005. **17**(3): p. 317–337.
55. Acs, Z.J. and L. Preston, *Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises, Technology, and Globalization: Introduction to a Special Issue on Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises in the Global Economy*. *Small Business Economics*, 1997. **9**: p. 1-6.
56. Robles-Estrada, C. and M. Gómez-Suárez. *E-Business Adoption in the SME's: towards an Integrated Theoretical-Empirical Research Framework*. in *The 10th International Conference on Global Business & Economic Development , Creativity & Innovation: Imperatives for Global Business and Development*. 2007. Ryukoku University Fukakusa Campus, Kyoto, Japan.
57. Eikebrokk, T.R. and D.H. Olsen, *An empirical investigation of competency factors affecting e-business success in European SMEs*. *Information & Management*, 2007. **44**(4): p. 364-383
58. Beck, T., A. DEMIRGUC-KUNT, and R. LEVINE, *SMEs, Growth, and Poverty: Cross-Country Evidence*. *Journal of Economic Growth* 2005. **10**(3): p. 199-229.
59. Deros, B.M., S.M. Yusof, and A.M. Salleh, *A benchmarking implementation framework for automotive manufacturing SMEs*. *Benchmarking: An International Journal*, 2006. **13**(4).
60. Kuo, H.C. and Y. Li, *A Dynamic Decision Model of SMEs' FDI*. *Small Business Economics*, 2003. **20**: p. 219–231.
61. Schröder, H.H., *Past, Present and Future of Knowledge Integration*, in *Knowledge Integration-The Practice of Knowledge Management in Small and Medium Enterprises*, A. Jetter, et al., Editors. 2006, Physica-Verlag HD. p. 175-191.
62. Choi, T.Y., *Korea's Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises: Unsung Heroes or Economic Laggards?* *Academy of Management Executive*, 2003. **17**(2).
63. Acs, Z.J., et al., *The Internationalization of Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises: A Policy Perspective*. *Small Business Economics*, 1997. **9**: p. 7–20.
64. Mezgar, I., G.L. Kovacs, and P. Paganelli, *Co-operative production planning for small- and medium-sized enterprises*. *International Journal of Production Economics*, 2000. **64**: p. 37-48.
65. Raymond, L. and A.M. Croteau, *Enabling the strategic development of SMEs through advanced manufacturing systems A configurational perspective*. *Industrial Management & Data Systems*, 2006. **106**(7): p. 1012-1032.
66. Hanna, V. and K. Walsh, *Small Firm Networks: A Successful Approach to Innovation?* . *R&D Management*, 2002. **32**(3): p. 201-207.
67. Corso, M., et al., *Knowledge management configurations in Italian small-to-medium enterprises*. *Integrated Manufacturing Systems*, 2003. **14**(1): p. 46-56.
68. Pullen, A., et al., *Configurations of external SME characteristics to explain differences in innovation performance*, in *High Technology Small Firms Conference* 2008: Twente University, Netherlands.
69. Zhan, H.F., et al., *A web-based collaborative product design platform for dispersed network manufacturing*. *Journal of Materials Processing Technology*, 2003. **138**(1-3): p. 600-604.
70. Nunes, M.B., F. Annansingh, and B. Eaglestone, *Knowledge management issues in knowledge-intensive SMEs*. *Journal of Documentation*, 2006. **62**(1).
71. Blomqvist, K., et al., *Towards networked R&D management: the R&D approach of Sonera Corporation as an example*. *R&D Management*, 2004. **34**(5): p. 591-603.
72. Gassmann, O. and M.M. Keupp, *The competitive advantage of early and rapidly internationalising SMEs in the biotechnology industry: A knowledge-based view*. *Journal of World Business*, 2007. **42**(3): p. 350-366.
73. Perrini, F., A. Russo, and A. Tencati, *CSR Strategies of SMEs and Large Firms. Evidence from Italy*. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 2007. **74**(3): p. 285-300.
74. Jones, O. and A. Macpherson, *Inter-Organizational Learning and Strategic Renewal in SMEs*. *Long Range Planning*, 2006. **39**: p. 155-175.
75. Schatz, C., *A Methodology for Production Development - The Body of Knowledge Approach*, in *Faculty of Engineering Science and Technology, Institute for Production and Quality Engineering*. 2006, Norwegian University of Science and Technology: Trondheim. p. 116.
76. Egbu, C.O., S. Hari, and S.H. Renukappa, *Knowledge management for sustainable competitiveness in small and medium surveying practices*. *Structural Survey*, 2005. **23**(1): p. 7-21.
77. Levy, M. and P. Powell, *SME Flexibility and the Role of Information Systems*. *Small Business Economics*, 1998 **11**(2): p. 183-196.
78. Mahemba, C.M. and E.J.D. Bruijn, *Innovation Activities by Small and Medium-sized Manufacturing Enterprises in Tanzania*. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 2003 **12**(3): p. 162-173.
79. Wu, M., et al., *E-commerce Adoption in China's Service SMEs: a Study from Web Usability Perspective*. *Journal of Business Systems, Governance and Ethics* 2007. **2**(4): p. 1-15.
80. Canavesio, M.M. and E. Martinez, *Enterprise modeling of a project-oriented fractal company for SMEs networking*. *Computers in Industry* 2007. **58**: p. 794-813.
81. Narula, R., *R&D Collaboration by SMEs: new opportunities and limitations in the face of globalisation*. *Technovation* 2004. **24**(2): p. 153-161.

82. Nieto, M.J. and Z. Fern'andez, *The role of information technology in corporate strategy of small and medium enterprises*. Journal of International Entrepreneurship 2005 **3**(4): p. 251-262.
83. Sarosa, S., *The information technology adoption process within Indonesian small and medium enterprises*, in *Faculty of Information Technology*. 2007, University of Technology: Sydney. p. 248.
84. Lawson, C.P., P.J. Longhurst, and P.C. Ivey, *The application of a new research and development project selection model in SMEs*. Technovation 2006. **26**(2): p. 242-250
85. Axelson, J.v., *Transfer of production knowledge to small and medium-size enterprises - a suggested model*, in *Department of Production Engineering*. 2005, Royal Institute of Technology: STOCKHOLM. p. 118.
86. Haga, T., *Action research and innovation in networks, dilemmas and challenges: two cases* AI & Society 2005. **19**(4): p. 362-383.
87. Sharma, M.K. and R. Bhagwat, *Practice of information systems: Evidence from select Indian SMEs*. Journal of Manufacturing Technology Management, 2006 **17**(2): p. 199 - 223.
88. Axelson, J.v., *On the development of production methods for transfer to small to medium-sized enterprises*, in *Department of Production Engineering*. 2007, KTH-Royal Institute of Technology: STOCKHOLM. p. 204.
89. Carbonara, N., *Information and communication technology and geographical clusters: opportunities and spread*. Technovation, 2005. **25**: p. 213-222.
90. Chen, M., et al., *Team Spirit: Design, implementation, and evaluation of a Web-based group decision support system*. Decision Support Systems, 2007. **43**: p. 1186-1202.
91. Actina, G., L. Zeltina, and N. Zeltins, *Small- and medium-sized enterprises in Latvia: economical and social aspects* International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation Management 2006. **6**(1/2): p. 124 - 150.
92. Lisotchkina, T.V., *Investment and innovation activities of enterprises under the conditions of market economy*. International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation Management, 2005. **6**(1-2): p. 24-32.
93. Levy, M., C. Loebbecke, and P. Powell, *SMEs, co-opetition and knowledge sharing: the role of information systems*. European Journal of Information Systems, 2003. **12**(1): p. 3-17
94. Kim, K.S., T.L. Knotts, and S.C. Jones, *viability of small manufacturing enterprises (SME) in the market*. Expert Systems with Applications 2008. **34**(1): p. 128-134.
95. Wang, C.H. and S.Y. Chou, *Entities' representation modes and their communication effects in collaborative design for SMEs*. The International Journal of Advanced Manufacturing Technology 2008 **37**(5-6): p. 455-470.
96. Lin, C., Y.A. Huang, and S.W. Tseng, *A Study of Planning and Implementation Stages in Electronic Commerce Adoption and Evaluation: The Case of Australian SMEs*. Contemporary Management Research, 2007. **3**(1): p. 83-100.
97. O'Regan, N., A. Ghobadian, and D. Galleary, *In search of the drivers of high growth in manufacturing SMEs*. Technovation, 2006. **26**: p. 30-41.
98. O'Regan, N., A. Ghobadian, and M. Sims, *Fast tracking innovation in manufacturing SMEs* Technovation, 2006. **26**(2): p. 251-261
99. Dickson, K.E. and A. Hadjimanolis, *Innovation and networking amongst small manufacturing firms in Cyprus*. International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research, 1998. **4**(1): p. 5-17.
100. Lee, C. and L.C. Ging, *SME Innovation in the Malaysian Manufacturing Sector*. Economics Bulletin, 2007. **12**(30): p. 1-12.
101. Rolfo, S. and G. Calabrese, *Traditional SMEs and innovation: the role of the industrial policy in Italy* Entrepreneurship and Regional Development, 2003. **15**(3): p. 253-271.
102. Adams, R., J. BESSANT, and R. PHELPS, *Innovation Management Measurement: A Review*. International Journal of Management Reviews, 2006. **8**(1): p. 21-47.
103. Mahajar, A.J.b., S.S. Abdullah, and J.b.M. Yunus. *The Effectiveness of Small and Medium Development Corporation (SMIDEC) Export Assistance Programs on Malaysian SME's*. in *Proceedings of Advances in Global Business Research* 2006. Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.
104. Scheel, C., *Knowledge clusters of technological innovation systems*. Journal of Knowledge Management, 2002. **6**(4): p. 356 - 367.